



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,125	12/27/2000	Matthew Rozek	088305/0132	4154

7590 01/27/2005
William T. Ellis
FOLEY & LARDNER
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,125

Applicant(s)

ROZEK ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan D. Schlaifer

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/5/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to an amendment to application 09/748,125 filed on 8/5/2004.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 18-20 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 18-20 have been amended, and claims 21-22 have been added.
3. The objections to claims 19-20 are withdrawn as required by the amendment.
4. The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is withdrawn as required by the amendment.
5. The rejections of claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-12, 14-17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Puckett are withdrawn as required by the amendment.
6. The rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett, further in view of Dysart, further in view of Casper are withdrawn as required by the amendment.
7. The rejections of claims 4-5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett, further in view of Dysart, further in view of Casper, further in view of Dowling are withdrawn as required by the amendment.
8. The rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett, further in view of Rusterholtz is withdrawn as required by the amendment.
9. The rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett, further in view of Loebig is withdrawn as required by the amendment.
10. The rejections of claim 13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett are withdrawn as required by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2178

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-18, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett (USPN 5,572,670—filing date 1/10/1994), further in view of Church et al. (USPN 5,794,234—filing date 8/14/1996), hereinafter Church, further in view of Edwards et al. (USPN 5,557,780—filing date 4/20/1995), hereinafter Edwards.**
12. **Regarding independent claim 1, Puckett discloses a computer implemented process for tracking inbound documents in a business-to-business electronic commerce system (in the Abstract, line 1, Puckett's invention is a bi-directional translator, which could serve this role in an electronic commerce system), the process comprising the steps of: a) receiving an inbound document at a translator (in col. 6, lines 15-20, there is an interpreter-converter module); b) the translator checking compliance of the document for translation from a source format to a desired target format (in col. 6, lines 20-25, the interpreter-converter checks the document as it converts it); c) attempting translation of the document, and capturing error data representing errors to a tracking database (in col. 2, lines 60-67, there is an error log database); and d) extracting data from the document and using it to provide an internal document identifier, and saving the internal document identifier to the tracking database as an index for the error data (in col. 3, lines 4-12, the error log database saves records about the document as identifiers to index the error data).**

Puckett fails to disclose that the documents are from trading partners, but Church discloses in col. 1, lines 30-50 that it is valuable to exchange information from trading partners because it facilitates use of the EDI protocol. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to exchange information from trading partners because it facilitates use of the EDI protocol. Puckett further fails to disclose that there is an internal document identifier correlated to the received inbound document from the trading partner. However, Edwards in col. 5, lines 50-65 discloses that there is an internal document identifier correlated to documents with the advantage of enabling post processing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have an internal document identifier correlated to documents with the advantage of enabling post processing.

13. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Puckett discloses that step b) comprises attempting recognition of syntax formats within a document data stream for compliance with configured formats, and configuring the translator in col. 6, lines 55-65 (there are specific linguistic rules that govern the translation process).
14. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Puckett discloses in steps 304 and 308 on Figure 3 that when an error is detected, it is processed and the document data stream is returned to.
15. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Puckett discloses in steps 304 and 308 on Figure 3 that errors are detected at the stage of a mapping process in which a field of a target document is not populated because the errors are detected before the event records have been encoded as tuples.

16. **Regarding dependent claim 11**, Puckett discloses that step d) comprises extracting data from both a document's enveloping information and from within the document, see col. 3, lines 5-7, "These events can be errors in the storage system or simply routine observations about the storage system."
17. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, Puckett discloses a process wherein error data is captured by writing values to variables in memory, and subsequently saving said values to the tracking database referenced to the internal document identifiers, see Fig. 3, items 308-316, Fig. 3 details how tuples are stored in a metalanguage (which must occur in variables), and then outputted to a database.
18. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, Puckett discloses the use of a variable that upon assignment of a subsequent value said subsequent value is treated as a valid variable value. (In Fig. 3, item 308, the information is translated into a tuple.) However, Puckett fails to disclose the use of a temporary variable that can only reference a single value. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that variables that reference only one value are useful because they can be used to represent single pieces of information of particular import. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in Puckett a temporary variable that can only reference a single value because it can be used to represent a single piece of information of particular import.
19. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, Puckett discloses a process wherein the memory variables include a list variable which can reference a plurality of values (in Fig. 3, item 308, the converter operates on tuples which involve a plurality of values).

20. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, Puckett discloses a process wherein error data is mapped to said variables according to mapping rules (in Fig. 3, item 312, there is a translation process, which must inherently involve a mapping according to mapping rules.)
21. **Regarding dependent claim 16**, Puckett disclose a process, wherein each variable has a label (variables inherently must have labels for a program to operate on them), and referencing a label of a variable in a mapping rule declares said variable (in col. 4, lines 10, referencing tuples activates the tuple and therefore must declare it).
22. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, Puckett discloses a process wherein step c) comprises generating an error code indicating the nature of the error, there being a pre-stored set of error codes and associated descriptions (in col. 6, lines 15-42 Pucket describes the generation of the error codes and the predetermined language used to do so.)
23. **Regarding independent claim 18**, it consists of independent claim 1, with dependent claims 12-14, 15, and 17 incorporated into the claim. Since these claims have already been rejected, claim 18 is rejected under similar rationale.
24. **Regarding independent claim 19**, the claim is an electronic commerce system that comprises means for performing the process of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.
25. **Regarding independent claim 20**, the claim is a computer program encoded on a computer-readable medium designed to perform the process of claim 1 and is rejected under similar rationale.

26. **Regarding dependent claim 21**, Puckett and Church fail to disclose the step of using the internal document identifier to identify error data corresponding to the inbound document from the trading partner and provide information to the trading partner based on the identified error data. However, Edwards in col. 10, lines 55-67 discloses making error checks based on an identifier in order to verify transactions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make error checks based on an identifier in order to verify transactions.
27. **Regarding independent claim 22**, the claim is a computer program encoded on a computer-readable medium designed to perform the process of claim 21 and is rejected under similar rationale.
28. **Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett, Church, further in view of Edwards, further in view of Dysart et al. (USPN 6,708,166 B1—filing date 5/11/2000), hereinafter Dysart, further in view of Casper et al. (USPN 5,526,484—filing date 12/10/1992), hereinafter Casper.**
29. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Puckett, Church and Edwards fails to disclose a process wherein step c) comprises parsing the received inbound document field-by-field and, for each field, checking the string byte size and delimiter characters. However, Dysart, in col. 16, lines 35-45 discloses field-by-field parsing in order to allow more exact control over search processing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate field-by-field parsing as in Dysart into Puckett, Church and Edwards in order to allow more exact control over search processing. In col. 16, lines 5-15 of Casper, Casper describes processing which involves string byte

checking and delimiter characters in order to successfully frame commands. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use string byte checking and delimiter characters in the manner of Casper in the context of Puckett, Church, Edwards and Dysart in order to successfully frame commands.

30. Claims 4-5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett, further in view of Church, further in view of Edwards, further in view of Dysart et al. (USPN 6,708,166 B1—filing date 5/11/2000), hereinafter Dysart, further in view of Casper, further in view of Dowling (USPN 6,157,988—filing date 12/23/1997).

31. Regarding dependent claim 4, Puckett, Church, Edwards, Dysart, and Casper fail to disclose a process wherein step c) further comprises checking sequence of fields against allowable record field groupings including required, optional, or conditional fields. However, Dowling, in col. 16, lines 43-67 describes the classification and checking of field types including required, optional, and conditional in order to help organize fields. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the classification and checking of field types in the manner of Dowling in the context of Puckett, Church, Edwards, Dysart, and Casper including required, optional, and conditional in order to help organize fields.

32. Regarding dependent claim 5, Puckett, Church, and Edwards fail to disclose a process in which the translator generates error data in step c) for field character set, character size, and delimiters and continues translation processing. However, Casper, in col. 11, lines 1-25, discloses error data that a processing unit generates error information when

Art Unit: 2178

analyzing a frame which encompasses a character set, character size, and delimiters in order to prevent erroneous processing of frame contents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to generate error information in the manner of Casper in the context of Puckett, Church and Edwards in order to prevent erroneous processing of frame contents.

33. **Regarding dependent claim 10**, the claim is essentially equivalent to claim 5 in that field attribute, truncation, and character set errors are generated in claim 5, and rejecting claim 10 is merely a manner of identifying them after construction of the document, which would have been obvious because they would have already been generated.
34. **Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett, further in view of Church, further in view of Edwards, further in view of Rusterholz et al. (USPN 4,945,479—filing date 7/31/1985), hereinafter Rusterholz.**
35. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, Puckett, Church, and Edwards fail to disclose that the translation process is aborted if a target document field is not populated. However, in col. 66, lines 5-35, Rusterholz describes a translation process in which a requirement of the process to avoid abortion of the process is that the translation needs to be populated because it is on the same register (see line 12). The reason for this is that it allows verification of valid entries. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to abort if a target document field is not populated in the manner of Rusterholz in the context of Puckett, Church, and Edwards in order to allow verification of valid entries.

36. **Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puckett, further in view of Church, further in view of Edwards ,further in view of Loebig (USPN 5,406,563—filing date 8/6/1993).**

37. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, Puckett, Church, and Edwards fail to disclose a process wherein step c) comprises identifying errors after construction of a target document and output of said document through a stream. However, Loebig, in the Abstract, lines 1-10, discloses stream processing of documents in order to monitor errors in document processing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to process documents through a stream in the context of Puckett in the manner of Loebig in order to monitor errors in document processing.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2178

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is (571) 272-4129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER